

SECRET-EYES ONLY

12 July 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Morning Meeting of 12 July 1968

25X1

[REDACTED]

Godfrey noted that the stories being carried this morning by CBS and NBC of a full Red alert in Saigon are not borne out by NMCC.

Godfrey advised that a draft of the Czechoslovak memorandum is ready and should be coordinated by the close of business.

Carver advised that he has been asked by State to prepare an item on the PHOENIX program for the President's briefing book. The Director asked Carver to check with Walt Rostow first.

Maury advised that CIA is now scheduled to appear before the Philbin subcommittee next Tuesday morning, 16 July.

Maury noted that William Darden is keeping Senator Russell informed of exchanges between CIA and members of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

X1

[REDACTED]

25X

X1

ADD/S&T reported that he attended the Air Force awards ceremony yesterday at which [REDACTED] was given the Distinguished Service Medal.

25X

[REDACTED]

SECRET-EYES ONLY

~~SECRET EYES ONLY~~

The Director drew attention to James J. Kilpatrick's column supporting S. 1035 in yesterday's Washington Star and raised the question as to whether or not it might be a good idea to arrange for an informed member of our Office of Medical Services to talk with Congressman Henderson or with a senior member of his staff in order to put the matter of psychological testing into perspective.

The Director noted that he reviewed the Agency's revised recruitment program and feels that its more selective approach to university campuses and its accent on engaging Agency professionals and experts with the prospective recruits are most appropriate. He urged responsiveness on the part of senior Agency officials and their subordinates who might be asked to accompany recruiters to various campuses and emphasized that discussions with prospects should be characterized by candor and openness about the nature of Agency work and responsibilities.

25X

L. K. White

~~SECRET EYES ONLY~~

JAMES J. KILPATRICK

U.S. Employees' Private Lives Need Protection

North Carolina's Sam Ervin Jr., one of the ablest members of the Senate, will be exercising his oratorical skills over on the House side of the Capitol this week. The senator is fighting for his bill to protect the constitutional rights of three million federal employees. Sad to say, he has his hands full.

Ervin's bill, bearing the names of 53 colleagues as co-sponsors, breezed through the Senate last September by a vote of 79-4. Subsequently, 11 absent members announced that they too would have voted for it. That is a remarkably impressive expression of senatorial conviction. You might think the House would be eager to join the parade.

Unfortunately, the bill has encountered squall conditions in a House subcommittee headed by Ervin's fellow North Carolinian, David Henderson. The Civil Service Commission, overwhelmed by the Senate vote ten months ago, is working feverishly to kill the Ervin bill, or at the very least to have it replaced by a tooth-

less measure that Henderson himself has sponsored.

Those who have followed Ervin's indignant investigations, much as they may regret the additional bureaucracy that Ervin's bill would create, will urge that the House go along with the Senate. If the Civil Service Commission had done the job it should have done, in protecting federal workers against some of the outrageous invasions of their private lives disclosed in the record, the Ervin bill would not be required. Regrettably, the abuses continue. Apparently nothing but a stiff act of Congress will put an end to these infuriating practices.

Despite all the concern that has been manifested on the Hill, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration undertook to put newly hired professionals through a "biographical information inventory." This stupid questionnaire has been abandoned as "not conclusive," but while it prevailed, NASA demanded answers to such questions as: "Approximately how old were

you when you first fell in love?" "To what extent were your parents affectionate toward each other?" "How often do you polish your own shoes?"

Ervin's investigations have turned up dozens of such impertinent examinations: "Do you have diarrhea once a month or more? . . . Do you dream about sex matters? . . . When was the with your wife? . . . How many times have you had sexual intercourse? . . . To what extent do you enjoy viewing still-life paintings? . . . Do you like and enjoy solitude? . . ."

These were actual questions put to prospective federal workers or to employees coming up for promotion. At the State Department, an 18-year-old college girl, seeking a summer job, was grilled by an investigator about her sex life. "Did this boy you're dating abuse you? Did he do anything unnatural with you? You didn't get pregnant, did you?"

The Ervin bill would bring

these shenanigans to a grinding halt. The measure also would impose an absolute prohibition, subject to criminal penalties, on the old office shakedowns for political contributions and savings bond subscriptions.

The bill would provide new remedies for the personnel specialist in a large non-defense agency who was denied a security clearance on mystifying grounds: It appeared that unnamed persons had told departmental investigators he had two friends with "questionable mannerisms."

The Civil Service Commission raises two main objections to the Ervin bill. First, it complains that Ervin's proposed "Board on Employee Rights" would be an expensive and unnecessary new agency. Second, it objects to a provision by which a federal employee, in certain circumstances, could go directly into federal court without exhausting intradepartmental grievance procedures.

Ervin's response is that the proposed board would be paid on a per diem basis, so the expense would be small; and he sees nothing in his bill that would interfere with normal grievance procedures—so long as these procedures are genuinely responsive.

There the matter stands. If Henderson's subcommittee seems determined to bottle up the bill, Ervin probably will try to attach his measure to some House-passed bill that the House especially wants. He is determined to see that federal workers have private lives to call their own. More power to him.

© 1968